



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,927	06/27/2003	Vineet Gupta	025.0353.US.UTL	8649
7590	01/31/2006		EXAMINER	
Kulpreet Rana Google, Inc. 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Bldg. 41 Mountain View, CA 94043			EBIRIM, EMEKA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,927	GUPTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emeka Ebirim	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/20/03, 9/9/04, 11/22/2004</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Status***

1. The application has been examined and claims 1-78 are rejected as detailed below and are pending in this office action.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1,2, 7-9, 11-13, 17-20, 22-26, 28-32, 36-45, 47-50, 53-61, 64-78, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,4,9-12,15,15,21-25,27,28, 30,35-39, 41-43, 47,48, 50-53, 58,60-66, 70-71,73-75, 80-83, 86,87, 89,90,92-95, 98-100 of copending Application No. 10407476.

4. The following table shows the claims in Instant Application No: 10/607,927 that are rejected by corresponding claims in Application No: 10/407,476.

Claims Comparison Table

Instant application No 10/607,927	Application No: 10/407,476
Claim 1	Claim 1
Claim 2	Claim 4
Claim 7	Claim 9
Claim 8	Claim 10
Claim 9	Claim 11
Claim 11	Claim 12
Claim 12	Claim 14
Claim 13	Claim 15
Claim 17	Claim 21
Claim 18	Claim 22
Claim 19	Claim 23
Claim 20	Claim 24
Claim 22	Claim 25
Claim 23	Claim 27
Claim 24	Claim 100
Claim 25	Claim 28
Claim 26	Claim 30

Claim 28	Claim 35
Claim 29	Claim 36
Claim 30	Claim 37
Claim 31	Claim 38
Claim 32	Claim 39
Claim 36	Claim 41
Claim 37	Claim 42
Claim 38	Claim 43
Claim 39	Claim 47
Claim 40	Claim 48
Claim 41	Claim 50
Claim 42	Claim 51
Claim 43	Claim 53
Claim 44	Claim 89
Claim 45	Claim 58
Claim 47	Claim 60
Claim 48	Claim 61
Claim 49	Claim 62
Claim 50	Claim 63
Claim 53	Claim 64
Claim 54	Claim 65

Claim 55	Claim 66
Claim 56	Claim 70
Claim 57	Claim 71
Claim 58	Claim 73
Claim 59	Claim 74
Claim 60	Claim 51,100
Claim 61	Claim 75
Claim 64	Claim 80
Claim 65	Claim 81
Claim 66	Claim 82
Claim 67	Claim 83
Claim 68	Claim 86
Claim 69	Claim 87
Claim 70	Claim 90
Claim 71	Claim 89
Claim 72	Claim 92
Claim 73	Claim 93
Claim 74	Claim 94
Claim 75	Claim 95
Claim 76	Claim 98
Claim 77	Claim 99

Claim 78	Claim 100
----------	-----------

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims of instant Application No 10/607,927 are essentially the same as claims of copending Application No 10/407,476 except that it recites “preferred country”.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to substitute “language” with “country” because selecting (triggering) the use of a “language” is similar to the use of “country” [see Pub No: US 2003/0191817 to Justin Fidler]

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

MPEP 2106 IV.B.2.(b)

6. A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Schrader, 22 F.3d at 296, 30 USPQ2d at 1460. To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application within the technological arts.

Art Unit: 2166

7. Claims 1-11, 24-41, 60-68, 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-11, 24-41, 60-68, 78 are directed to a system, however all components are software [page 8 lines 10-12] and thus lacking the necessary hardware for any functionality to be realized it is as such non-statutory.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant recites "programming country" [page 8 lines 11-12]. It is not clear what this information is meant to convey. Applicant is required to review the specification for similar informalities.

Appropriate correction is required for proper disclosure of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub No: 2004/0194099 to Lamping et al (hereinafter Lamping).

Claim 1.

Lamping discloses:

A system for ordering search results, comprising:

a country selector dynamically determining at least one preferred country applicable to search results generated responsive to a search executed on potentially retrievable information and provided in a plurality of search result countries; and [selector, country, search result, potentially retrievable, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081]

a search result orderer ordering at least some of the search results in consideration of the at least one preferred country. [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081]

Claim 2.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

an interface characterizer determining the at least one preferred country using interface characteristics. [country, interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 3.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 2, wherein the interface characteristics comprise at least one country accepted by the user interface. [country, interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 4.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:
an IP characterizer determining the at least one preferred country using IP characteristics. [country, IP, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 5.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 4, wherein the interface characteristics comprise a network address of a client application from which the search query was submitted [IP address (network address), see Lamping paragraph, 0081].

Claim 6.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

an indexer ranking the search results [ranking, see Lamping paragraph 0082];
and

the search result orderer ordering at least some of the search results relative to
the at least one preferred country. [order, search result, country, see Lamping
paragraph 0067, 0082, 0081]

Claim 7.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 6, further comprising at least one of:
the search result orderer demoting each such search result in a country other
than the at least one preferred country and promoting each such search result in the at
least one preferred country by at least one position [demote, country, see Lamping
paragraph 0047, 0081]; and

the search result orderer promoting each such search result in a country other
than the at least one preferred country and demoting each such search result in the at
least one preferred country by at least one position. [orderer, promoter, country, see
Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081];

Claim 8.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

a scorer assigning a numerical score to the search results [scorer, see Lamping paragraph 0045]; and

a search result orderer adjusting the numerical score of at least some of the search results in the at least one preferred country [orderer, scorer, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0045].

Claim 9.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 8, further comprising at least one of:
the search result orderer increasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the at least one preferred country and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country; and [country, orderer, scorer, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0045, 0081].

the search result orderer decreasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the at least one preferred country and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country [country, orderer, scorer, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0045, 0081].

Claim 10.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 8, further comprising:

a country selector including one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries in the at least one preferred country [country, selector, less preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081]; and

the search result orderer adjusting the numerical score, comprising at least one of increasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country, and decreasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country.
[country, increase, decrease, numerical score, see Lamping paragraph 0048, 0081]

Claim 11.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

the search result orderer sorting the at least some of the search results with adjusted numerical scores. [resorting, numerical score, see Lamping paragraph 0015]

Claim 12.

Lamping discloses:

A method for ordering search results, comprising:

dynamically determining at least one preferred country applicable to search results generated responsive to a search executed on potentially retrievable information and provided in a plurality of search result countries [country, search result, potentially retrievable, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081]; and

ordering at least some of the search results in consideration of the at least one preferred country. [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081]

Claim 13.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 12, further comprising:

determining the at least one preferred country using interface characteristics.

[country, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 14.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 13, wherein the interface characteristics comprise at least one country accepted by the user interface. [country, interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 15.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 12, further comprising:
determining the at least one preferred country using IP characteristics. [IP
parameter, country, see Lamping paragraph 0081]

Claim 16.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 5 hereinabove.

Claim 17.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 6 hereinabove.

Claim 18.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 7 hereinabove.

Claim 19.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 8 hereinabove.

Claim 20.

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 9 hereinabove.

Claim 21.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 19, further comprising:

including one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries in the at least one preferred country [preferred, country, see Lamping paragraph 0081] ; and

adjusting the numerical score, comprising at least one of [adjusting the numerical score, see Lamping paragraph 0015]:

increasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country [increase numerical score, country see Lamping paragraph 0048, 0081]; and

decreasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country [decrease numerical score, country see Lamping paragraph 0048, 0081].

Claim 22.

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 11 hereinabove.

Claim 23.

Lamping discloses:

A computer-readable storage medium holding code for performing the method according to claim 12 [computer-readable storage, see Lamping paragraph 0038].

Claim 24.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it recites “apparatus”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 1 hereinabove.

Claim 25.

Lamping discloses:

A system for providing preferred country ordering of search results, comprising:
a parser receiving a search query describing potentially retrievable information provided in a plurality of search result countries [parser, country, see Lamping paragraph 0040, 0081];

an indexer executing a search by evaluating the search query against information characteristics maintained in a searchable data repository [indexer, see Lamping paragraph 0041]; and

a country promoter dynamically determining at least one preferred country applicable to search results generated responsive to the executed search, and ordering at least some of the search results in consideration of the at least one preferred country [promoter, country, see Lamping paragraph 0041, 0081].

Claim 26.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a user interface characterizer determining a country accepted by a user interface [user interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0015, 0046, 0081]; and
a country selector selecting the country as the at least one preferred country [selector, country, see Lamping paragraph, 0043, 0081].

Claim 27.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

an Internet Protocol (IP) characterizer determining a country based on a network address of a client application from which the search query was submitted [IP, determine country see Lamping paragraph 0081]; and

a country selector selecting the country as the at least one preferred country [selector, country see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081].

Claim 28.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:
a search result orderer ordering the search results based on a match of a country of such search results to the at least one preferred country [order, match, country see Lamping paragraph 0067, 0068, 0081].

Claim 29.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising: a search result orderer ordering the search results by degree of match of a country of such search results to the at least one preferred country [degree, order, match, country, see Lamping paragraph 0067, 0068, 0081].

Claim 30.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 29, further comprising:

the search result orderer demoting the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country by a predefined shifting factor [demote, shifting factor, country, see Lamping paragraph 0047, 0081].

Claim 31.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 30, wherein the predefined factor substantially equals two (2.0) [shifting factor, country, see Lamping paragraph 0047].

Claim 32.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 29, further comprising:

the search result orderer promoting the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country by a predefined shifting factor. [promote, shifting factor, country, see Lamping paragraph 0047, 0081].

Claim 33.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a scorer ordering each of the search results by degree of match to the information characteristics. [scorer, degree, match, country, see Lamping paragraph 0047, 0045].

Claim 34.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a country detector detecting a country associated with at least one search result [identify (detect), search results, country see Lamping paragraph 0042, 0081].

Claim 35.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 34, further comprising at least one of:

a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) analyzer determining a URL extension for the at least one search result [identify (Uniform Resource Locator (URL) see Lamping paragraph 0054, 0081)];

a domain registrar examiner examining a domain registrar address for the at least one search result and inferring the country from a business associated therewith [see Lamping paragraph 0081];

a country inferrer inferring the country from at least one of the IP address of a Web server from which the search result was obtained, a search result document for the

at least one search result, or other Web pages on a same Web site as the at least one search result [see Lamping paragraph, 0081]; and

a hyperlink analyzer examining anchor text of hyperlinks to the search result document, text near the hyperlinks, or countries of the Web pages with hyperlinks to the search result document [country, hyperlink, see Lamping paragraph 0041, 0081].

Claim 36.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, wherein the search results are assigned a numerical score, further comprising:

a search result orderer increasing the numerical score assigned to at least some of the search results in the at least one preferred country [country, numerical score, search results, increase, see Lamping paragraph 0089, 0081].

Claim 37.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 36, wherein the numerical score is adjusted in accordance with the formula:

$$s_i = (s_i + 1) / 2$$

where s_i comprises the numerical score for each such search result i .

[see Lamping paragraph 0048]

Claim 38.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 36, wherein the search results are assigned a numerical score, further comprising:

a search result orderer decreasing the numerical score assigned to at least some of the search results in the at least one preferred country [country, numerical score, search results, decrease, see Lamping paragraph 0089, 0081].

Claim 39.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a presenter presenting the search results. [see Lamping paragraph 0052]

Claim 40.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 39, further comprising:

the presenter performing at least one of controlling enablement of presentation of at least some of the search results for each of the at least one preferred country, grouping together at least some of the search results for each of the at least one preferred country and arranging at least some of the search results for each of the at

least one preferred country next to at least some of the search results for at least one country other than the at least one preferred countries prior to presentation to the user. [see Lamping paragraph 0052, 0081]

Claim 41.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:
a country selector including one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries in the at least one preferred country [country, selector, less preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081].

Claim 42.

Claim 42 is essentially the same as claim 25 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 25 hereinabove.

Claim 43.

Claim 43 is essentially the same as claim 26 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 26 hereinabove.

Claim 44.

Claim 44 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 27 hereinabove.

Claim 45.

Claim 45 is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 28 hereinabove.

Claim 46.

Claim 46 is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 29 hereinabove.

Claim 47.

Claim 47 is essentially the same as claim 30 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 30 hereinabove.

Claim 48.

Claim 48 is essentially the same as claim 31 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 31 hereinabove.

Claim 49.

Claim 49 is essentially the same as claim 32 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 32 hereinabove.

Claim 50.

Claim 50 is essentially the same as claim 33 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 33 hereinabove.

Claim 51.

Claim 51 is essentially the same as claim 34 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 34 hereinabove.

Claim 52.

Claim 52 is essentially the same as claim 35 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 35 hereinabove.

Claim 53.

Claim 53 is essentially the same as claim 36 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 36 hereinabove.

Claim 54.

Claim 54 is essentially the same as claim 37 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 37 hereinabove.

Claim 55.

Claim 55 is essentially the same as claim 38 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 38 hereinabove.

Claim 56.

Claim 56 is essentially the same as claim 39 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 39 hereinabove..

Claim 57.

Claim 57 is essentially the same as claim 40 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 40 hereinabove..

Claim 58.

Claim 58 is essentially the same as claim 41 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 41 hereinabove.

Claim 59.

Lamping discloses:

A computer-readable storage medium holding code for performing the method according to claim 42 [computer-readable storage, see Lamping paragraph 0038].

Claim 60.

Claim 60 is essentially the same as claim 25 except that it recites “apparatus”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 25 hereinabove.

Claim 61.

Lamping discloses:

A system for dynamically determining country preferences and ordering of search results, comprising [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081]:

a parser receiving a search query request message and parsing at least one of terms and attributes from the search query request message to identify potentially retrievable Web content provided in a plurality of search result countries [parser, web content, search query, see Lamping paragraph 0040];

an indexer executing a search by evaluating the at least one of terms and attributes against information characteristics maintained in a searchable data repository and generating search results responsive to the executed search [indexer, see Lamping paragraph 0041];

a country promoter determining at least one preferred country, comprising [promoter, country, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081]:

a country determiner evaluating characteristics of at least one of the user interface and the Internet Protocol (IP), and selecting the at least one preferred country based on the evaluated characteristics [see Lamping paragraph 0081];

a country orderer ordering at least some of the search results in consideration of the at least one preferred country [country, order, search results, see Lamping paragraph 0081, 0068]; and

a presenter presenting the search results as search result response messages.

[see Lamping paragraph 0052]

Claim 62.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein evaluating the user interface further comprises:

a user interface characterizer determining at least one country accepted by the user interface. [country, user interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0015, 0046, 0077, 0081]

Claim 63.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein evaluating the IP characteristics further comprises:

an Internet Protocol (IP) characterizer determining a network address of a client application from which the search query request message was submitted. [Internet protocol, determine, address, see Lamping paragraph 0081]

Claim 64.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein the search results are generated in a ranked order, further comprising [rank, order, search result, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084]:

a search result order ordering at least some of the search results relative to the at least one preferred country by a predefined shifting factor, comprising at least one of demoting each such search result in a country other than the at least one preferred country by the predefined shifting factor and promoting each such search result in the at least one preferred country by at least one position, and promoting each such search result in a country other than the at least one preferred country by the predefined shifting factor and demoting each such search result in the at least one preferred country by at least one position. [rank, order, shifting factor, promote, demote, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084]

Claim 65.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 64, further comprising:
the search result orderer adjusting the predefined shifting factor based on available context in the search query request message and the search results. [order, shifting factor, search result, search query, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084]

Claim 66.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein the search results are generated in a ranked order by numerical score, further comprising:

a search result orderer adjusting the numerical score of at least some of the search results by a predetermined weighting factor comprising at least one of increasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the at least one preferred country and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country, and decreasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the at least one preferred country and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country. [adjust, numerical score, weighting factor, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084]

Claim 67.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 66, further comprising:

the search result orderer adjusting the predefined weighting factor based on available context in the search query request message and the search results [adjust, numerical score, weighting factor, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084].

Claim 68.

A system according to claim 61, wherein the search query request message and each search result response message is HTTP-compliant. [HTTP-compliant, see

Lamping paragraph 0068]

Claim 69.

Claim 69 is essentially the same as claim 61 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 61 hereinabove.

Claim 70.

Claim 70 is essentially the same as claim 62 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 62 hereinabove.

Claim 71.

Claim 71 is essentially the same as claim 63 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 63 hereinabove.

Claim 72.

Claim 72 is essentially the same as claim 64 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 64 hereinabove.

Claim 73.

Claim 74 is essentially the same as claim 65 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 65 hereinabove.

Claim 74.

Claim 74 is essentially the same as claim 66 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 66 hereinabove.

Claim 75.

Claim 75 is essentially the same as claim 67 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 67 hereinabove.

Claim 76.

Claim 76 is essentially the same as claim 68 except that it recites “method”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 68 hereinabove.

Claim 77.

Lamping discloses:

A computer-readable storage medium holding code for performing the method according to claim 69. [computer-readable storage, see Lamping paragraph 0038]

Claim 78.

Claim 78 is essentially the same as claim 69 except that it recites “apparatus”. It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 69 hereinabove.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emeka Ebirim whose telephone number is 571-272-3994. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30pm - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Name: Emeka Ebirim
Art Unit: 2166

KHANH B. PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

